UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/617,593	07/11/2003	Arthur Eugene McNair	VOCO-09-273	3686

26875   7590   09/25/2007
WOOD, HERRON & EVANS, LLP
2700 CAREW TOWER
441 VINE STREET
CINCINNATI, OH 45202

EXAMINER
WOZNIAK, JAMES S

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2626	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
09/25/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/617,593	MCNAIR ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	James S. Wozniak	2626	

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>02 July 2007</u>.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>*1-12 and 14-25*</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>*1-12 and 14-25*</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on <u>*11 July 2003*</u> is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1.   In response to the office action from 3/30/2007, the applicant has submitted an

amendment, filed 7/2/2007, amending independent claims 1, 9, and 22, while arguing to traverse

the art rejection based on the added limitation regarding selectively enabling an input modality

based on the state of a dialog workflow description and then controlling an output prompt based

on the enabled input modality *(Amendment, Pages 17-20)*. The applicant's arguments have been

fully considered, but are moot with respect to the new grounds of rejection necessitated by the

amended claims and in view of Bourguet et al *(U.S. Patent Application Publication:*

2002/0178344).

2.   Due to amended claims 7 and 10, the examiner has withdrawn the previous claim

objection directed to minor informalities.

3.   Due to the amendment of claims 9 and 22, the examiner has withdrawn the previous 35

U.S.C. 112, first paragraph rejections.

4.   In light of the applicant's arguments regarding amended claims 1 and 9 *(Amendment,*

Page 14), the examiner has withdrawn the previous 35 U.S.C. 101 rejection directed to these

claims and their associated dependent claims. The examiner notes that although amending claim

22 to include a "tangible" computer readable medium overcomes an aspect of the previous 35

U.S.C. 101 rejection directed to this claim and its associated dependent claims, the term

"tangible" is not defined in the specification, thus raising an issue of new matter *(see the below*

35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph rejection). Also, the steps claimed are still do not include the

program execution by a computer, thus, the previous 35 U.S.C. 101 rejection is maintained for

this reason. To overcome this rejection the examiner recommends changing "one or more

processors" to –one or more *computer* processors-- *(supported in the specification at Page 10,*

Lines 13-14).

Double Patenting

5.   The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine

grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or

improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible

harassment by multiple assignees.   A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection

is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined

application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined

application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference

claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re*

Goodman, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225

USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re*

Vogel, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and In *re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163

USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may

be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting

ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned

with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the

scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal

disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR

3.73(b).

6.   Claims 1-25 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type

double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-16 and 48-49 of copending Application

No. 10/617,422. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably

distinct from each other because both claimed inventions are directed to the same system/method

for executing a multimodal software application utilizing input and output peripheral devices,

workflow descriptions based on the software application, and interface components. Although

App. No. 10/617,422 omits the prompt control of the presently claimed invention, the omission

of such an element would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art because both systems

essentially perform the same steps of providing input data, processing that data according to a

workflow, and providing output data *(i.e., a prompt)* in response.

This is a <u>provisional</u> obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting

claims have not in fact been patented.

Claim Rejections -- 35 USC § 101

7.   35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

> Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or
> any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and
> requirements of this title.

8.   **Claims 22-25** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed

to non-statutory subject matter.

Claim 22 is drawn to program "instructions" as recited in the preamble and as such is

non-statutory subject matter. Data structures not claimed as encoded in computer readable media

are descriptive material per se and are not statutory because they are not capable of causing

functional change in the *computer*. See, e.g., Warmerdam, 33 F.3d at 1361, 31 USPQ2d at 1760

(claim to a data structure per se held nonstatutory). Such claimed data structures do not define

any structural and functional interrelationships between the data structure and other claimed

aspects of the invention, which permit the data structure's functionality to be realized. In

contrast, a claimed tangible computer readable medium *encoded* with a data structure defines

structural and functional interrelationships between the data structure and the *computer software*

and hardware components which permit the data structure's functionality to be realized, and is

thus statutory. Similarly, computer programs claimed as computer listings per se, i.e., the

descriptions or expressions of the programs are not physical "things." They are neither computer

components nor statutory processes, as they are not "acts" being performed. Such claimed

computer programs do not define any structural and functional interrelationships between the

computer program and other claimed elements of a computer, which permit the computer

program's functionality to be realized. To overcome this rejection the examiner recommends

changing "one or more processors" to –one or more *computer* processors-- *(supported in the*

specification at Page 10, Lines 13-14).

Dependent claims 23-25 fail to overcome the 35 U.S.C. 101 rejection directed towards

claim 22, and thus, are also directed to non-statutory subject matter by virtue of their

dependency.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

9.   The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making
> and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it
> pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode
> contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

10.   **Claims 22-25** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with

the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter that was not described

in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that

the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Specifically, claims 22-25 recite a "tangible computer-readable storage medium," which

is not disclosed in the specification. Although the specification discloses a number of computer

readable mediums, which can be considered as being directed to a tangible medium *(see Page*

10), the term "tangible" is not used in the specification to define these mediums. Thus, claims

22-25 fail to comply with the written description requirement. It is additionally pointed out,

however, that the tangible mediums disclosed in the specification are defined by the term

"recordable" media *(Page 10, Line 22)*, thus, it is recommended that the claims be amended to

recite --computer-readable recordable medium-- in order to overcome this 35 U.S.C. 112, first

paragraph rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

11.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

12.   **Claims 1-3, 7-9, 11-12, 15, and 19-20** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Morin et al (U.S. Patent: 5,748,841) in view of Bourguet et al *(U.S. Patent*

Application Publication: 2002/0178344).

With respect to **Claim 1**, Morin discloses:

A first set of peripheral devices for receiving inputs from a user in a plurality of

modalities and a second set of peripheral devices for generating outputs to a user in a plurality of

modalities *(various input and output devices, Col. 11, Line 40- Col. 12, Line 15; and Fig. 1)*;

The multimodal software application, wherein said multimodal software application

receives first data, that is reflective of an input, from a first set of peripheral devices and output

second data, to form an output, to a second set of peripheral devices *(multimodal target software*

application capable of receiving data from a set of input devices and outputting data from a set

of output devices, Col. 13, Lines 30-67; and various input and output devices, Col. 11, Line 40-

Col. 12, Line 15);

A dialog engine in communication with the multimodal software application, wherein

said dialog engine executes a workflow description, having a plurality of dialog units that form a

dialog, received from the multimodal software application and provide the first data to the

multimodal software application *(dialog manager, having a plurality of dialog instruction steps,*

that executes dialog tasks in accordance with an application script and provides input data to an

application, Col. 9, Line 1- Col. 10, Line 25);

Said dialog engine further controlling outputting of a prompt from the workflow

description based on an input state of the first set of peripheral devices *(dialog manager utilizing*

context and history to monitor an input state, Col. 10, Lines 1-25 and generating request and

other dialog prompts, Col. 9, Lines 1-57; and output devices, Col. 8, Lines 17-37); and

A respective interface component associated with each peripheral device within said first

and second sets; wherein each interface component is configured to provide the second data, if

any, to the associated peripheral device and receive the first data, if any, from the associated

peripheral device *(I/O device drivers that provide input output data to their associated devices,*

Col. 6, Lines 5-48; Col. 7, Lines 17-27; and Col. 8, Lines 17-37).

Although Morin recites the ability to generate an output prompt based on the state of

various multimodal inputs *(Col. 9, Line 1- Col. 10, Line 25)* and further notes enabling different

multimodal I/O devices for different dialog tasks *(dialog dependent devices, Col. 13, Lines 55-*

61), Morin does not specifically suggest selectively enabling an input modality from a set of

peripheral devices based on a state within the dialog and then outputting a prompt based on an

input state of the selectively enabled multimodal input devices. Bourguet, however, recites a

dialog manager in a multimodal interactive system *(Figs. 1-2)* that dynamically chooses input

modalities available to a user based on a current dialog state *(Paragraphs 0083 and 0089)*.

Bourguet further notes that the states of the available input modalities at a particular dialog state

are utilized to generate an output prompt *(Paragraph 0088)*.

Morin and Bourguet are analogous art because they are from a similar field of endeavor

in multimodal user interface systems. Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary

skill in the art, at the time of invention, to modify the teachings of Morin with the means for

selectively choosing available input modalities based on a dialog state as taught by Bourguet in

order to provide a multimodal user interface that is capable of dynamically selecting modalities

that are expected by a particular dialog *(Paragraph 0083)*.

With respect to **Claim 2**, Morin further discloses:

The control includes interrupting the prompt if the first data is received while the prompt

is being output *("talk over" feature, Col. 12, Lines 1-15)*.

With respect to **Claim 3**, Morin further discloses:

Delaying outputting of the prompt if one of the first set of peripheral devices is receiving

the first data *(dialog turns that require the dialog manager to wait for a complete user response*

before taking its turn, Col. 9, Lines 35-56).

With respect to **Claim 7**, Morin further discloses:

The first set of peripheral devices includes one or more of a speech recognition system, a radio-frequency identifier scanner, a bar code scanner, a touch screen, a keypad, and a computer *(input devices, Col. 7, Lines 17-27)*.

With respect to **Claim 8**, Morin further discloses:

The second set of peripheral devices includes one or more of a voice synthesis system, a display screen and a computer *(output devices, Col. 8, Lines 17-37)*.

With respect to **Claim 9**, Morin discloses:

Executing a workflow description received from the multimodal application, said workflow description including a plurality of dialog units that form a dialog *(application dialog script, which defines task dialog steps, executed by a dialog manager, Col. 9, Line 1- Col. 10, Line 25; and Col. 14, Lines 1-23)*;

Receiving inputs from a user in at least one modality from at least one peripheral device of a plurality of peripheral devices and generating outputs to a user in at least one modality with at least one peripheral device from another plurality of peripheral devices *(various input and output devices, Col. 11, Line 40- Col. 12, Line 15; and Fig. 1)*;

Outputting a prompt of a first workflow object via a peripheral device of the another plurality of peripheral devices, said prompt related to the multimodal application *(outputting task requests or messages to a user, Col. 9, Lines 35-56; Col. 12, Lines 1-15)*; and

Controlling the outputting of the prompt according to an input state of the plurality of peripheral devices *(dialog manager utilizing context and history to monitor an input state, Col. 10, Lines 1-25 and generating request and other dialog prompts, Col. 9, Lines 1-57; and output devices, Col. 8, Lines 17-37)*.

Although Morin recites the ability to generate an output prompt based on the state of various multimodal inputs *(Col. 9, Line 1- Col. 10, Line 25)* and further notes enabling different multimodal I/O devices for different dialog tasks *(dialog dependent devices, Col. 13, Lines 55-61)*, Morin does not specifically suggest selectively enabling an input modality from a set of peripheral devices based on a state within the dialog and then outputting a prompt based on an input state of the selectively enabled multimodal input devices. Bourguet, however, recites a dialog manager in a multimodal interactive system *(Figs. 1-2)* that dynamically chooses input modalities available to a user based on a current dialog state *(Paragraphs 0083 and 0089)*. Bourguet further notes that the states of the available input modalities at a particular dialog state are utilized to generate an output prompt *(Paragraph 0088)*.

Morin and Bourguet are analogous art because they are from a similar field of endeavor in multimodal user interface systems. Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of invention, to modify the teachings of Morin with the means for selectively choosing available input modalities based on a dialog state as taught by Bourguet in order to provide a multimodal user interface that is capable of dynamically selecting modalities that are expected by a particular dialog *(Paragraph 0083)*.

With respect to **Claim 11**, Morin discloses the "talk over" feature, as applied to Claim 2.

With respect to **Claim 12**, Morin further discloses:

The step of outputting includes outputting an audio prompt *(spoken messages, Col. 12, Lines 1-15)*; and

The step of receiving includes receiving voice data from a speech recognition system *(speech recognizer, Col. 7, Lines 28-48)*.

With respect to **Claim 15**, Morin further discloses:

Performing the step of terminating if the data is received from a predetermined peripheral

device; and omitting the step of terminating if the input is received from other than the

predetermined device *("talk over" feature that interrupts a spoken prompt in response to a*

speech input and would inherently omit prompt cancellation if any other type of input was

received, Col. 12, Lines 1-15; and Col. 7, Lines 28-32).

Claim 19 contains subject matter similar to Claim 3, and thus, is rejected for the same

reasons.

With respect to **Claim 20**, Morin further discloses:

The step of delaying includes the steps of: delaying outputting the prompt to one of the

another plurality of peripheral devices; and permitting outputting the prompt without delay to

another of the plurality of peripheral devices *(simultaneous output of text and speech and*

canceling only speech messages using a "talk-over" feature, Col. 12, Lines 1-15).

13.   **Claims 4-5 and 16-18** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Morin et al in view of Bourguet et al and further in view of Gergic et al *(U.S. Patent Application*

Publication: 2002/0198719).

With respect to **Claims 4-5 and 16-17**, Morin in view of Bourguet discloses the

multimodal system and method featuring prompt control based on an enabled input modality for

processing input/output data, as applied to Claims 1 and 9. Although Morin discloses the ability

to handle successive user responses *(Col. 12, Lines 41-54)* and request a user response to fill-in

missing information *(Col. 9, Lines 35-56),* Morin in view of Bourguet does not specifically

suggest processing a user input data directed to two prompts, which would result in an avoided

subsequent prompt. Gergic, however, discloses the ability of a user to fill two fields of missing

information with a single utterance in response to an initial dialog, which does not require the

output of a subsequent dialog prompt *(Paragraph 0121)*.

Morin, Bourguet, and Gergic are analogous art because they are from a similar field of

endeavor in interactive multimodal dialog systems. Thus, it would have been obvious to a

person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of invention, to modify the teachings of Morin in

view of Bourguet with the ability of a user to fill two fields of missing information taught by

Gergic in order to provide a means for supporting parallel activation of dialog objects *(Gergic,*

Paragraph 0104) and allow for more efficient user/machine interaction.

With respect to **Claim 18**, Gergic further recites:

The data relates to the first workflow object and a plurality of other workflow objects

(filling more than one field, Paragraph 0121).

14.   **Claims 6 and 14** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morin et

al in view of Bourguet et al and further in view of Hanle et al *(U.S. Patent: 5,012,511)*.

With respect to **Claims 6 and 14**, Morin in view of Bourguet discloses the multimodal

system and method featuring prompt control based on an enabled input modality and device

drivers for processing input/output data, as applied to Claims 2 and 11. Morin in view of

Bourguet does not teach the use of non-interruptible prompts, however Hanle discloses the use of

such prompts in an interactive dialog system *(Col. 9, Lines 33-51)*.

Morin, Bourguet, and Hanle are analogous art because they are from a similar field of

endeavor in interactive voice response systems. Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of

ordinary skill in the art, at the time of invention, to modify the teachings of Morin in view of

Bourguet with the non-interruptible prompts taught by Hanle in order to force the user to listen to

important prompts, such as error prompts *(Hanle, Col. 9, Lines 50-51)*.

15.   **Claims 10, 22-23, and 25** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Morin et al in view of French-St. George et al *(U.S. Patent: 6,012,030)*.

With respect to **Claims 10**, Morin in view of Bourguet discloses the multimodal system

and method featuring prompt control based on an enabled input modality and device drivers for

processing input/output data, as applied to Claim 9. Although Morin teaches the concept of

speech control of computer applications *(Col. 13, Lines 61-67)*, Morin in view of Bourguet does

not explicitly disclose prompts relating to visual control of a GUI screen, however French-St.

George discloses such prompts *(Col. 7, Line 37- Col. 8, Line 18)*.

Morin, Bourguet, and French-St. George are analogous art because they are from a

similar field of endeavor in interactive multimodal dialog systems. Thus, it would have been

obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of invention, to modify the teachings

of Morin with the generation of prompts relating to visual control of a GUI screen as taught by

French-St. George in order to provide a means for dynamically adjusting audio prompts based on

a user's interaction *(French-St. George, Col. 3, Line 64- Col. 4, Line 2)*.

Claim 22 contains subject matter similar to Claims 9 and 10, and thus, is rejected for the

same reasons. Morin further discloses method implementation at a server computer *(Col. 5,*

Lines 43-56), which would inherently require some type of stored instruction set for method execution.

With respect to **Claim 23**, Morin discloses the "talk over" feature, as applied to Claim 2.

Claim 25 contains subject matter similar to Claim 3, and thus, is rejected for the same reasons.

16.   **Claim 21** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morin et al in view of Bourguet et al and further in view of Setlur et al *(U.S. Patent: 5,956,675)*.

With respect to **Claim 21**, Morin in view of Bourguet discloses the multimodal system and method featuring prompt control based on an enabled input modality and device drivers for processing input/output data, as applied to Claim 19. Morin in view of Bourguet does not teach analyzing if a user's input relates to a prompt to identify a valid barge-in attempt, however, Setlur recites executing a barge-in attempt only when a speech input is related to an expected aural prompt response *(Col. 5, Lines 1-23)*.

Morin, Bourguet, and Setlur are analogous art because they are from a similar field of endeavor in interactive voice response systems. Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of invention, to modify the teachings of Morin in view of Bourguet with the barge-in identification means taught by Setlur in order to provide a means for improved barge-in reliability *(Setlur, Col. 5, Lines 18-20)*.

17.   **Claim 24** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morin et al in

view of Bourguet et al in view of French-St George et al and further in view of Gergic et al *(U.S.*

Patent Application Publication: 2002/0198719).

With respect to **Claim 24,** Morin in view of Bourguet and further in view of French-St.

George discloses the multimodal system and method featuring prompt control based on an

enabled input modality and device drivers for processing input/output data, as applied to Claim

22. Although Morin discloses the ability to handle successive user responses *(Col. 12, Lines 41-*

54) and request a user response to fill-in missing information *(Col. 9, Lines 35-56)*, Morin does

not specifically suggest processing a user input data directed to two prompts, which would result

in an avoided subsequent prompt. Gergic, however, discloses the ability of a user to fill two

fields of missing information with a single utterance in response to an initial dialog, which does

not require the output of a subsequent dialog prompt *(Paragraph 0121)*.

Morin, Bourguet, French-St. George, and Gergic are analogous art because they are from

a similar field of endeavor in interactive multimodal dialog systems. Thus, it would have been

obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of invention, to modify the teachings

of Morin in view of Bourguet and further in view of French-St. George with the ability of a user

to fill two fields of missing information taught by Gergic in order to provide a means for .

supporting parallel activation of dialog objects *(Gergic, Paragraph 0104)* and allow for more

efficient user/machine interaction.

Conclusion

18.   Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this

Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a).

Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this

final action.

19.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's

disclosure:

Maes *(U.S. Patent: 7,216,351)-* discloses a system capable of enabling different input

modalities.

20.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to James S. Wozniak whose telephone number is (571) 272-7632.

The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th, 7:30-5:00, F, 7:30-4, Off Alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Patrick Edouard can be reached at (571) 272-7603. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

James S. Wozniak
9/10/2007

PATRICK N. EDOUARD
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER